

Customer No.: 31561
Application No.: 10/065,566
Docket No.: 9747-US-PA

REMARKS

Present Status of the Application

The Office Action rejected claims 21, 22 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The Office Action rejected claims 1-5, 7-8, 10, 12-16 and 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Sekiya (US Patent No.6,583,775). The Office Action also rejected claim 11 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sekiya in view of Hack (US Application No. 2002/0030647). Furthermore, claims 6, 9 and 17 are rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sekiya in view of Filliman (US Patent No.5,255,220).

Applicant has amended claims 1, 3, 12, 14, 18 and canceled claims 21-23. After entry of the foregoing amendments, claims 1-20 remain pending in the present application, and reconsideration of those claims is respectfully requested.

Response to Rejections under 35 USC §112

The Office Action rejected claims 21, 22 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 21, 22 and 23 are canceled, which renders the rejections set forth moot.

Customer No.: 31561
Application No.: 10/065,566
Docket No.: 9747-US-PA

Response to Rejections under 35 USC §102

Claims 1-5, 7-8, 10, 12-16 and 18-20 are rejected under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by Sekiya. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections for at least the reasons set forth below.

Independent claims 1, 12 and 18 are allowable for at least that Sekiya does not disclose, teach or suggest the feature that "a discharging unit coupled to a point for connecting the light-emitting device driving unit for discharging the light-emitting device according to the voltage level of a control signal" as amended in claims 1 and 12, and "discharging the light-emitting device from a point for connecting the light-emitting device and the driving circuit according to the voltage level of a control signal while the light-emitting device is driven by a driving current" as claimed in claim 18.

In col. 11, lines 29-33 of Sekiya, upon which the Office Action relied for such rejection, it was disclosed that the TFT3 of Sekiya discharges the holding capacitor Cs and finally "to cut off the current to flow to the light emitting element OLED." The Office Action fails to appreciate that Sekiya does not disclose or teach "the discharging unit coupled to the light-emitting device for discharging the light-emitting device according to the voltage level of a control signal," while asserting that the third TFT3 of Sekiya corresponds to the discharging unit of the present invention. Instead, Sekiya disclosed that the current to flow to the OLED is cut off by discharging through the holding capacitor and by nulling the Vgs of the second TFT2.

Customer No.: 31561
Application No.: 10/065,566
Docket No.: 9747-US-PA

"To cut off the current to flow to the light emitting element" does not mean to discharge the light-emitting device. In the claimed subject matter set forth in claims 1 and 12, the discharging unit is coupled to a point for connecting the light-emitting device driving unit. The discharging of the light-emitting device is accomplished by the discharging unit rather than the holding capacitor Cs.

In Response to Argument on page 9 of the Office Action, it is asserted that "cutting off current to an OLED" does "remove the electric charges out of the OLED. Thus, the OLED is discharged, since it is not receiving current or charge." Applicant does not agree with such assertions. Please refer to FIG.1 of the Sekiya, if TFT2 is turned off by discharging the holding capacitor Cs, the current flowing to the light emitting element is cut off. The light emitting element is isolated from the ground and charges in the light emitting element is accumulated therein. The problem as stated in the Specification of the invention concerning the accumulated charges through continuous operation is not solved. The driving voltage for driving the light-emitting device will increase and the working life of the device will be shortened.

Thus, Sekiya does not anticipate claims 1, 12 and 18 and the rejection should be withdrawn.

If independent claims 1, 12 and 18 are allowable over the prior art of record, then their respective dependent claims 2-11, 13-17 and 19-20 are allowable as a matter of law, because these dependent claims contain all features/elements/steps of their respective independent claims 1, 12 and 18.

Customer No.: 31561
Application No.: 10/065,566
Docket No.: 9747-US-PA

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is believed that all pending claims 1-20 are in proper condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would expedite the examination of the above-identified patent application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Date: *September 2, 2005*

Respectfully submitted,

Belinda Lee
Belinda Lee

Registration No.: 46,863

Jiang Chyun Intellectual Property Office
7th Floor-1, No. 100
Roosevelt Road, Section 2
Taipei, 100
Taiwan
Tel: 011-886-2-2369-2800
Fax: 011-886-2-2369-7233
Email: belinda@jcipgroup.com.tw
Usa@jcipgroup.com.tw